

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

1. STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ex rel.)
W.A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his capacity as)
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF)
OKLAHOMA and OKLAHOMA SECRETARY)
OF THE ENVIRONMENT C. MILES TOLBERT,)
in his capacity as the TRUSTEE FOR)
NATURAL RESOURCES FOR THE)
STATE OF OKLAHOMA,)

Plaintiffs,)

v.)

05-CV-0329 TCK-SAJ

1. TYSON FOODS, INC.,)
2. TYSON POULTRY, INC.,)
3. TYSON CHICKEN, INC.,)
4. COBB-VANTRESS, INC.,)
5. AVIAGEN, INC.,)
6. CAL-MAINE FOODS, INC.,)
7. CAL-MAINE FARMS, INC.,)
8. CARGILL, INC.,)
9. CARGILL TURKEY PRODUCTION, LLC,)
10. GEORGE'S, INC.,)
11. GEORGE'S FARMS, INC.,)
12. PETERSON FARMS, INC.,)
13. SIMMONS FOODS, INC., and)
14. WILLOW BROOK FOODS, INC.,)

Defendants.)

CARGILL TURKEY PRODUCTION, LLC,)

Third Party Plaintiff,)

v.)

CITY OF WESTVILLE AND CITY OF)
TAHLEQUAH,)

Third Party Defendants,)

and)

EXHIBIT 2

)
TYSON FOODS, INC., TYSON POULTRY,)
INC., TYSON CHICKEN, INC.,)
COBB-VANTRESS, INC., GEORGE’S, INC.,)
GEORGE’S FARMS, INC., PETERSON FARMS,)
INC., SIMMONS FOODS, INC., AND)
WILLOW BROOK FOODS, INC.,)
)
Third Party Plaintiffs,)
)
v.)
)
CITY OF TAHLEQUAH, <i>ET AL.</i> ,)
)
Third Party Defendants.)

CARGILL TURKEY PRODUCTION, LLC’S FIRST AMENDED CROSS-CLAIM

I. BACKGROUND

Defendant/Cross-Claim Plaintiff, Cargill Turkey Production, LLC (referred to hereinafter as “CTP”), having denied all liability to the State of Oklahoma, *ex rel.* W.A. Drew Edmondson, in his capacity as Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma, and Oklahoma Secretary of the Environment, C. Miles Tolbert, in his capacity as the Trustee for Natural Resources for the State of Oklahoma (“Plaintiffs”), hereby set forth its cross- claim pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 13(g).

1. As specified in further detail below, CTP’s claims stated herein are prompted by and based upon the allegations contained in the Plaintiffs’ First Amended Complaint (“Complaint”), which are incorporated by reference as though fully restated herein. In their Complaint, Plaintiffs assert that CTP caused injury to the Illinois River Watershed (“IRW”),¹ including the biota, lands, water and sediments therein as a consequence of the practice of land applying poultry litter that comes from poultry growing operations operated by farmers who contract with a Defendant/Third Party Plaintiff to grow that company’s poultry (“independent

contract farmers”). Plaintiffs assert that the use of poultry litter in agricultural operations has resulted in the release and disposal of “hazardous materials,” “hazardous wastes,” and “solid wastes” as those terms are defined by federal statute. Plaintiffs attribute their claimed injury to the release of nutrients such as phosphorus and nitrogen, as well as five additional constituents set forth in Paragraph No. 58 of the Complaint. Plaintiffs purport to state ten counts against CTP, including claims for cost recovery under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (“CERCLA”), 42 U.S.C. § 9607(a); natural resource damages under CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9607(f); injunctive relief under the Citizen Suit provision of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, (“SWDA”), 42 U.S.C. § 6972; public and private nuisance and nuisance *per se* under Oklahoma law and federal common-law; trespass under Oklahoma law; violations of Oklahoma statutes and regulations, namely 27A O.S. § 2-6-105, 2 O.S. § 2-18.1, 2 O.S. § 10-9.7, OAC §35:17-5-5, and OAC § 35:17-3-14; and unjust enrichment, and restitution and disgorgement under Oklahoma law. Plaintiffs are purporting to recover past and future damages, restitution, environmental assessment, remediation, punitive damages, temporary and permanent injunctive relief, attorney’s fees and costs.

2. CTP denies that its conduct and that of the independent contract poultry farmers is anything other than lawful, prudent, agricultural activity that has been officially sanctioned by the Legislatures of the States of Oklahoma and Arkansas. By virtue of the broadly cast allegations of the Complaint, it is clear that Plaintiffs are asserting that any conduct within the IRW which results in the release of phosphates or phosphorus-containing compounds (hereinafter referred to collectively as “phosphorus”), nitrogen or any of the other listed constituents is unlawful activity, which gives rise to liability to Plaintiffs for damages and

¹ Complaint at ¶ 1

injunctive relief. As such, in light of Plaintiffs' stated intention to hold CTP jointly and severally liable for the entirety of the alleged injury claimed to exist in the IRW, CTP is entitled and compelled to bring third-party claims and cross-claims against other persons and entities who conduct activities within the IRW that release phosphorus, nitrogen or any other purportedly harmful constituent into the IRW. Should the Plaintiffs prevail on their claims and theories, thereby holding CTP liable to any extent, City of Watts, Cross-Claim Defendant, should be liable in the same manner to the extent of its several share of liability under the theory of contribution. Furthermore, the Cross-claim Defendant should be held liable to CTP under its claims asserted herein for unjust enrichment and pursuant to the Citizen Suit provisions of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, 42 U.S.C. § 6972. Accordingly, CTP sets forth the following allegations based upon its knowledge, information and/or belief.

3. Any contributions from poultry litter applications by CTP or the independent poultry farmers with whom they contract to the overall loading of phosphorus, nitrogen or any other purportedly harmful constituent in the IRW (which contribution is denied) would be insignificant in comparison to the contributions of Cross-Claim Defendant and the thousands of other persons, corporations and political subdivisions operating in the IRW.

4. Numerous Municipal Publicly Operated Treatment Works ("POTWs") discharge directly into the tributaries in the IRW wastewater containing some or all of the same constituents identified in the Complaint. The Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality ("ODEQ") has estimated that these POTWs, standing alone, account for over approximately one-third of the total observed phosphorus load in the IRW. No POTWs were joined by the Plaintiffs in the Complaint.

II. PARTIES

A. Cross-Claim Plaintiff, Cargill Turkey Production, LLC

5. Cargill Turkey Production, LLC, is a corporation under the laws of Delaware, and has its principal place of business in Kansas.

B. Cross-Claim Defendant, City of Watts

6. Cross-Claim Defendant, the City of Watts, is a municipal corporation in the State of Oklahoma, which discharges treated sewage and/or wastewater, and has allowed the disposal of sewage sludge from its treatment plants into the IRW. Upon information and belief, the City of Watts has also engaged in the practice of applying fertilizers and pesticides to properties of the City of Watts within the IRW. These activities are on-going and continuous. The operations and activities described above have and continue to result in the release of phosphorus and other constituents into the IRW. Accordingly, if the conduct of the CTP gives rise to liability to the Plaintiffs under their claims set forth in the Complaint (which is denied), then the City of Watt's conduct and operations, which results in the release of some or all of the same constituents into the IRW, give rise to its liability to CTP.

7. Cross-Claim Defendant, Tahlequah Public Works Authority which discharges treated sewage and/or wastewater pursuant to NPDES permit no. OK0026964, and has allowed the disposal of sewage sludge from its treatment plants into the IRW, which include but are not limited to the constituents alleged to have been discharged into the IRW in the Complaint. The operations and activities described above have and continue to result in the release of phosphorus and other constituents into the IRW. Accordingly, if the conduct of CTP gives rise to liability to the Plaintiffs under their claims set forth in the Complaint (which is denied), then Tahlequah

Public Works Authority's conduct and operations, which result in the release of some or all of the same constituents into the IRW, gives rise to its liability to CTP.

8. Cross-Claim Defendant, the Westville Utility Authority, is a municipal corporation in the State of Oklahoma, which discharges treated sewage and/or wastewater pursuant to NPDES permit no. OK0028126, and has allowed the disposal of sewage sludge from its treatment ponds into the IRW. These activities are on-going and continuous. The operations and activities described above have and continue to result in the release of phosphorus and other constituents into the IRW. Accordingly, if the conduct of CTP gives rise to liability to the Plaintiffs under their claims set forth in the Complaint (which is denied), then the Westville Utility Authority's conduct and operations, which result in the release of some or all of the same constituents into the IRW, gives rise to its liability to Third Party CTP.

9. Cross-Claim Defendant, Adair County, Oklahoma, is responsible for the proper design, creation and maintenance of its county roads within the IRW. Upon information and belief, Adair County has engaged in mining activities within the IRW. These activities are on-going and continuous. Upon further information and belief, Adair County has failed to properly maintain its county roads, and unlawfully permitted and acquiesced to the building of illegal dams in the IRW. By engaging in these activities, Adair County has contributed through erosion and run off during storm events the release of some or all of the constituents alleged in the Complaint into the IRW. The operations and activities described above have and continue to result in the release of phosphorus and other constituents into the IRW. Accordingly, if the conduct of CTP gives rise to liability to the Plaintiffs under their claims set forth in the Complaint (which is denied), then Adair County's conduct and operations, which result in the release of some or all of the same constituents into the IRW, gives rise to its liability to CTP.

10. Cross-Claim Defendant, Cherokee County, Oklahoma, is responsible for the proper design, creation and maintenance of its county roads within the IRW. Upon information and belief, Cherokee County has engaged in mining activities within the IRW. These activities are on-going and continuous. Upon further information and belief, Cherokee County has failed to properly maintain its county roads, and unlawfully permitted and acquiesced to the building of illegal dams in the IRW. By engaging in these activities, Cherokee County has contributed through erosion and run off during storm events the release of some or all of the constituents alleged in the Complaint into the IRW. The operations and activities described above have and continue to result in the release of phosphorus and other constituents into the IRW. Accordingly, if the conduct of CTP gives rise to liability to the Plaintiffs under their claims set forth in the Complaint (which is denied), then Cherokee County's conduct and operations, which result in the release of some or all of the same constituents into the IRW, gives rise to its liability to CTP.

11. Cross-Claim Defendant, Delaware County, Oklahoma, is responsible for the proper design, creation and maintenance of its county roads within the IRW. Upon information and belief, Delaware County has engaged in mining activities within the IRW. These activities are on-going and continuous. Upon further information and belief, Delaware County has failed to properly maintain its county roads, and unlawfully permitted and acquiesced to the building of illegal dams in the IRW. By engaging in these activities, Delaware County has contributed through erosion and run off during storm events the release of some or all of the constituents alleged in the Complaint into the IRW. The operations and activities described above have and continue to result in the release of phosphorus and other constituents into the IRW. Accordingly, if the conduct of CTP gives rise to liability to the Plaintiffs under their claims set forth in the

Complaint (which is denied), then Delaware County's conduct and operations, which result in the release of some or all of the same constituents into the IRW, gives rise to its liability to CTP.

12. Cross-Claim Defendant Sequoyah County, Oklahoma, is responsible for the proper design, creation and maintenance of its county roads within the IRW. Upon information and belief, Sequoyah County has engaged in mining activities within the IRW. These activities are on-going and continuous. Upon further information and belief, Sequoyah County has failed to properly maintain its county roads, and unlawfully permitted and acquiesced to the building of illegal dams in the IRW. By engaging in these activities, Sequoyah County has contributed through erosion and run off during storm events the release of some or all of the constituents alleged in the Complaint into the IRW. The operations and activities described above have and continue to result in the release of phosphorus and other constituents into the IRW. Accordingly, if the conduct of CTP gives rise to liability to the Plaintiffs under their claims set forth in the Complaint (which is denied), then Sequoyah County's conduct and operations, which result in the release of some or all of the same constituents into the IRW, gives rise to its liability to CTP.

IV. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

13. This court has subject matter jurisdiction over the claims set forth herein on the same basis as the Court has jurisdiction over the claims and parties identified in the Complaint. The damages claimed by the Plaintiffs in the Complaint are alleged to have been caused by CTP's activities within the Illinois River Watershed as defined by the Plaintiffs in Paragraph Nos. 22-23 of the Complaint. CTP likewise asserts that the acts and omissions of the Cross-Claim Defendants occurred within the State of Oklahoma. Moreover, Plaintiffs have alleged claims under CERCLA and SWDA seeking abatement, assessment damages, remediation, damages for loss value and restoration of the natural resource, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 42

U.S.C. § 9613 (b) and 42 U.S.C. § 6972(a). Additionally, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367, this Court has supplemental jurisdiction over this matter and any claims for contribution from other potential responsible parties as well as any claims against other potentially responsible parties under the SWDA and the common-law of unjust enrichment.

14. Personal jurisdiction is properly exercised over Cross-Claim Defendants because the activities engaged in by Cross-Claim Defendants are occurring or have occurred on property located within the State of Oklahoma. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(e), (k).

V. STATEMENTS OF FACT

A. The Underlying Lawsuit

15. Plaintiffs filed their Complaint against CTP and others on June 13, 2005. On August 18, 2005, Plaintiffs filed their Amended Complaint against CTP, a copy of which is attached hereto as Ex. “1.”

16. Plaintiffs purport to bring their claims as “Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma and...Trustee for Natural Resources of the State of Oklahoma....” (Am. Cmplt. pg. 1).

17. Plaintiffs allege that CTP’s operations in the IRW have “caused injury to the IRW, including the biota, lands, waters and sediments therein.”

18. Plaintiffs allege the “1,069,530-acre Illinois River Watershed (“IRW”) straddles the Oklahoma-Arkansas border. The approximately 576,030 acres of the IRW that are located in Oklahoma include portions of Delaware, Adair, Cherokee and Sequoyah counties...as well as its major tributaries, the Baron (a/k/a Barren) Fork River, the Caney Creek and the Flint Creek.” [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 22, 23]

19. Plaintiffs allege the “Illinois River feeds into the 12,900 acre Tenkiller Ferry Lake....” [Am. Cmplt. at ¶ 26]

20. Plaintiffs allege that “[i]n recent years these resources have been and are continuing to be polluted, degraded, and their uses have been and are continuing to be injured and impaired,” and that “[t]his pollution of and injury to the IRW, including the biota, lands, waters and sediments therein, are indivisible,” which CTP has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 29, 30]

21. Plaintiffs allege that CTP “[is] responsible for this pollution of, as well as the degradation of, impairment of and injury to the IRW, including biota, lands, waters and sediments therein”, by virtue of its growers’ agriculture practices. Those alleged agriculture practices include the land application of poultry litter as a fertilizer “in excess of any agronomic need,” which CTP has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶ 31, 50]

22. Plaintiffs allege that any application of poultry litter in excess of agronomic need “constitutes waste disposal rather than any normal or appropriate application of fertilizer,” which CTP has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶ 50]

23. Plaintiffs allege these alleged “waste disposal practices lead to run-off and release of large quantities of phosphorous and other hazardous substances, pollutants and contaminants in the poultry waste onto and from the fields and into the waters of the IRW,” and “large quantities of phosphorous and other hazardous substances, pollutants and contaminants to accumulate in soils,” which lead to continued and future run-off into the waters of the IRW, which CTP has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 52, 53]

24. Plaintiffs allege that poultry litter contains “a number of constituents that can and do cause harm to the environment and pose human health hazards.” The constituents alleged by Plaintiffs include:

- a. phosphorus/phosphorus compounds;

- b. nitrogen/nitrogen compounds;
- c. arsenic/arsenic compounds;
- d. zinc/zinc compounds;
- e. copper/copper compounds;
- f. hormones; and/or
- g. microbial pathogens.

25. Plaintiffs allege that “[t]he lands and waters in the IRW...contain elevated levels of a number of constituents.” [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 58, 59]

26. Plaintiffs assert that the nutrients and metal compounds listed above in Paragraph No. 23 are hazardous substances under CERCLA, which CTP denies. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 61, 62]

27. Plaintiffs assert that “poultry waste is a solid and/or hazardous waste under the SWDA,” which CTP has denied and continue to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶ 92]

28. Plaintiffs allege that CTP “has in the past been or is now a generator of poultry waste and/or has in the past been or is now an owner or operator of a treatment, storage or disposal facility for poultry waste,” which CTP has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶ 93]

29. Plaintiffs allege that CTP is “a ‘person’ as defined by SWDA who has contributed to and/or is contributing to the past or present handling, storage, treatment, transportation or disposal of poultry waste in the IRW...,” which CTP has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶ 94]

30. Plaintiffs allege that “[a]n imminent and substantial endangerment to health or the environment may be presented and is in fact presented as a direct and proximate result of ... [CTP’s] ... respective contribution to the handling, storage, treatment, transportation or disposal

of poultry waste in the IRW...,” which CTP has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶ 95]

31. Plaintiffs claim that CTP has “intentionally” created a private and public nuisance under both Oklahoma and Federal law “[a]s a result of [its] poultry waste disposal practices,” which include the “placement/contribution to the placement of poultry wastes where they are likely to cause pollution,” which CTP has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 99-104, 110-114]

32. Plaintiffs have also claimed that CTP’s activities as alleged in the Complaint constitute “an actual and physical invasion of and interference with the State of Oklahoma’s property interests in the IRW...,” which CTP has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 120-122]

33. Plaintiffs allege that CTP has violated 27A O.S. § 2-6-105, 2 O.S. § 2-18.1 “by and through [its] wrongful poultry waste disposal practices...,” and thus, Plaintiffs state they are entitled to civil penalties for each respective violation pursuant to 27A O.S. § 2-3-504 and 2 O.S. § 2-16, which CTP has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 129-132]

34. Plaintiffs further allege that CTP has violated the Animal Waste Management Plan criteria set forth in Oklahoma Administrative Code, § 35:17-3-14 by its “wrongful poultry waste disposal practices...,” and thus, Plaintiffs state they are entitled to civil penalties pursuant to 2 O.S. § 9-212, which CTP has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 138, 139]

35. Plaintiffs claim by engaging “in improper poultry waste disposal practices,” CTP has “avoided the costs of properly managing and disposing of [its] poultry waste” to its economic benefit and at the expense of the Plaintiffs’ rights, and thus, CTP has had a benefit conferred upon it by Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs claim that this is an unjust enrichment and seek

“disgorgement of all gains...realized in consequence of [its] wrongdoing,” which CTP has denied and continues to deny. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 141-147]

36. Pursuant to their claims, Plaintiffs are seeking all past monetary damages, future damages, permanent injunctive relief, declaratory judgment, restitution, exemplary damages, statutory penalties, pre-judgment interest, attorney’s fees and costs (including but not limited to court costs, expert and consultants costs, and litigation and investigative expenses). [Am. Cmplt. at Prayer for Relief ¶¶ 1-8]

B. General Allegations Regarding Cross-Claim Defendant

37. CTP incorporates Paragraph Nos. 1 through 36 as though fully set forth herein.

38. CTP has denied and continues to deny all of the Plaintiffs’ allegations of wrongdoing, and denies that it is responsible for or has contributed to any purported pollution in the IRW.

39. CTP served Cross-Claim Defendant, City of Watts, on September 28, 2005 with its written notice of CTP’s claims against them based upon Plaintiffs’ claims pursuant to the Oklahoma Governmental Tort Claims Act, 51 O.S. § 156 and under the Solid Waste Disposal Act (“SWDA”), by registered mail, properly addressed and postage prepaid to Cross-Claim Defendant. [Notice, attached hereto as Ex. “2”].

40. Cross-Claim Defendant, City of Watts, failed to either approve or deny CTP’s claims within ninety (90) days of its submission; thus, CTP’s claims have been deemed denied pursuant to 51 O.S. § 157.

41. CTP served Cross Claim Defendants, Tahlequah Public Works Authority and Westville Utility Authority on January 24, 2006, with its written notice of its claims against them based upon Plaintiffs’ claims pursuant to the Oklahoma Governmental Tort Claims Act, 51 O.S.

§ 156 and under the Solid Waste Disposal Act (“SWDA”), by registered mail, properly addressed and postage prepaid to Cross Claim Defendants. [Notices, attached hereto as Ex. “3”].

42. Cross-Claim Defendants, Tahlequah Public Works Authority and Westville Utility Authority failed to either approve or deny CTP’s claims within ninety (90) days of its submission; thus CTP’s claims have been deemed denied pursuant to 51 O.S. § 157.

43. On July 28, 2005, CTP and others served Cross-Claim Defendants Adair County, Oklahoma; Cherokee County, Oklahoma; Delaware County, Oklahoma; and Sequoyah County, Oklahoma with their written notice of their claims based upon the Original Complaint filed by Plaintiffs on June 13, 2005 pursuant to the Oklahoma Governmental Tort Claims Act, 51 O.S. § 157. [Governmental Tort Claim Notices, attached hereto as Ex. “4”].

44. On October 7, 2005, October 14, 2005 and November 10, 2005, CTP and others served supplemental written notice of their claims based upon the First Amended Complaint filed by Plaintiffs on August 18, 2005 upon Cross-Claim Defendants Adair County, Oklahoma; Cherokee County, Oklahoma; Delaware County, Oklahoma; and Sequoyah County, Oklahoma. [Supplemental Governmental Tort Claim Notices, attached hereto as Exhibit “5”].

45. Cross-Claim Defendants, Adair County, Oklahoma; Cherokee County, Oklahoma; Delaware County, Oklahoma; and Sequoyah County, Oklahoma failed to either approve or deny CTP’s claims within ninety (90) days of its submission; thus, CTP’s claims have been deemed denied pursuant to 51 O.S. § 157.

46. Cross-Claim Defendants have and continue to engage in operations and/or activities within the IRW, more specifically identified in Paragraphs No. 6 - 12, which includes but are not limited to discharging sewage and wastewater, applying of organic and commercial fertilizer and chemicals, and engaging in other activities which result in the release of some or all

of the constituents alleged in the Complaint into the IRW as defined by Plaintiffs. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶58, 61-64]

47. To the extent the Court finds the natural resources of the IRW, including the biota, lands, waters and sediments have been adversely impacted as alleged by Plaintiffs in their Complaint, such adverse impacts have been caused or contributed to by the acts and omissions of Cross-Claim Defendants which have resulted in the release of the same or similar constituents as those allegedly contained in poultry litter into the IRW.

48. As stated in their Complaint, Plaintiffs allege that CTP, by applying poultry litter as a fertilizer to the lands within the IRW, have caused and are causing “an unreasonable invasion of, interference with, impairment to, inconvenience to, annoyance to and injury to the State of Oklahoma and the public’s beneficial use and enjoyment of the IRW, including the biota, lands, waters and sediments therein.” [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 100, 111]

49. Although CTP has denied and continues to deny all of the allegations of wrongdoing as alleged by Plaintiffs, should CTP be found liable to Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs recover damages or injunctive relief pursuant to any of Plaintiffs’ claims for nuisance or trespass CTP asserts that it is entitled to contribution pursuant to 12 O.S. § 832 from Cross-Claim Defendants based upon their operations and/or activities within the IRW.

50. Should CTP be found liable to Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs recover damages or injunctive relief deriving from any wastes, pollutants or constituents released or emanating from the lands, facilities or operations of the Cross-Claim Defendants, such recovery would constitute an unjust enrichment of the Cross-Claim Defendants, coupled with a resulting injustice to CTP, which entitles CTP to recover from the Cross-Claim Defendants the amount of damages and/or

cost of any injunctive relief associated with, responding to or for any injury caused by Cross-Claim Defendants' ownership and/or operations within the IRW.

51. As stated in the Complaint, Plaintiffs allege that “[t]he IRW, including the lands, waters and sediments therein, constitutes a ‘site or area where a hazardous substance...has been deposited, stored, disposed of, or place, otherwise come to be located;’ and, as such, constitutes a ‘facility’ within the meaning of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(9).” [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶72, 81]

52. While CTP denies and continues to deny the allegations of wrongdoing contained within the Complaint, CTP states that should the Court find that the IRW, including the biota, lands, waters and sediments therein constitute a “facility” under CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(9), then the IRW is also a “facility” as to the Cross-Claim Defendants’ operations and/or activities within the IRW.

53. As stated in the Complaint, Plaintiffs allege that CTP “is a ‘person,’ and thus, a potentially responsible party within the meaning of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(21).” If the Court finds that CTP, based upon the activities of their independent growers, is a “person” within the meaning of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(21), then Cross-Claim Defendants are also “persons” under CERCLA in that they engage in operations and/or activities within the IRW that have and continue to result in the release of phosphorous and some or all of the constituents alleged in the Complaint into the IRW.

54. As stated in the Complaint, Plaintiffs allege that CTP and others are covered within the meaning of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9607(a), in that they “[have], individually and collectively, arranged for disposal of [their] poultry waste which contains hazardous substances...which has been released to and within the IRW...,” and that they “individually and collectively, have been owners and/or operators during the time their poultry waste containing

these hazardous substances was generated and disposed of and released into the IRW....” If the Court finds that CTP is a potentially responsible party under CERCLA, 42 U.S. § 9607(a), then Cross-Claim Defendants are also potentially responsible parties under CERCLA in that they engage in operations and/or activities within the IRW that have and continue to result in the release of phosphorous and some or all of the constituents alleged in the Complaint into the IRW. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 74, 75, 83 and 84].

55. Plaintiffs allege in the Complaint that by and through CTP’s activities and operations, “‘hazardous substances’ within the meaning of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(14)...were disposed of in the IRW, including the lands, waters and sediments therein, resulting in ‘releases’ and/or ‘threatened releases’ of hazardous substances within the meaning of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601 (22).” In the event, the Court finds that poultry litter as outlined in Plaintiffs’ Complaint at Paragraph Nos. 79 and 80, is a “hazardous substance” within the meaning of CERCLA, then Cross-Claim Defendants’ activities and/or operations within the IRW which result in the release or threatened release of some or all of the same constituents as poultry litter would, likewise, be considered a release of a “hazardous substance” under CERCLA into the IRW. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 72, 80]

56. While continuing to deny the allegations of wrongdoing in the Complaint, in the event that CTP is found liable under Plaintiffs’ CERCLA cost recovery claims for the alleged release of “hazardous substances,” then Cross-Claim Defendants should, likewise, be liable for its activities and/or operations within the IRW which result in the release of the same alleged “hazardous substances” into the IRW.

57. Although CTP has denied and continues to deny all of the allegations of wrongdoing as alleged by Plaintiffs, should CTP be found liable under CERCLA § 107 for

Plaintiffs' cost recovery claims, and be ordered to pay response costs, which include, but are not limited to costs of monitoring, assessing and evaluation of the waters, wildlife and biota in the IRW, to the Plaintiffs, then CTP is entitled to contribution pursuant to CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9613(f) and pursuant to its unjust enrichment claim from Cross-Claim Defendants because their activities and/or operations within the IRW have resulted in the release of some, if not all of the same constituents alleged by the Plaintiffs as "hazardous substances." Thus, as a result of their activities and/or operations, if CTP is required to pay any damages to Plaintiffs, then Cross-Claim Defendants should be required to pay for its respective shares of any response costs adjudged against CTP.

58. Although CTP has denied and continues to deny all of the allegations of wrongdoing as alleged by Plaintiffs, should CTP be found liable to Plaintiffs under CERCLA §107, and a declaratory judgment be entered holding CTP liable for all future necessary responses costs, then CTP is entitled to a declaratory judgment from Cross-Claim Defendants holding them similarly liable for their respective shares of any future response costs due to their activities and/or operations within the IRW, which have resulted in the release of some, if not all, of the same constituents alleged by the Plaintiffs as "hazardous substances." Furthermore, if CTP is required to pay any future necessary response costs under CERCLA §107, pursuant to any declaratory judgment entered by the Court, then Cross-Claim Defendants should, likewise, be required to pay for its respective shares of any future necessary response costs adjudged against the CTP.

59. Plaintiffs also seek natural resource damages pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 9607. In the Complaint, Plaintiffs allege that "[t]he Oklahoma Secretary of the Environment, acting on behalf of the State of Oklahoma, is the designated CERCLA trustee for 'natural resources' in, belonging

to, managed by, held in trust by, appertaining to or otherwise controlled by the State of Oklahoma,” and that as trustee, the Oklahoma Secretary of the Environment “shall assess damages to natural resources for purposes of CERCLA for those natural resources under their trusteeship.” [Am. Cmplt. at ¶ 79]

60. Plaintiffs claim that “[a]s a result of the release of hazardous substances...into the IRW...there has been injury to, destruction of, and loss of natural resources in the IRW, including the land, fish, wildlife, biota, air, water, ground water, drinking water supplies and all other such resources therein....” According to Plaintiffs’ allegations, these alleged injuries are “continuing” in nature, and Plaintiffs have “incurred reasonable and necessary costs to assess and evaluate this injury and loss of natural resources.” [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 85-87]

61. For their alleged natural resource damages claim under CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9607 (a), Plaintiffs seek “(a) the cost to restore, replace, or acquire the equivalent of such natural resources; (b) the compensable value of lost services resulting from the injury to such natural resources; and (c) the reasonable cost of assessing injury to the natural resources and the resulting damages.” [Am. Cmplt. at ¶ 89]

62. While continuing to deny the allegations of wrongdoing in the Complaint, in the event that CTP is found liable under Plaintiffs’ CERCLA § 107 natural resource damages claim for the alleged release of “hazardous substances,” then Cross-Claim Defendants should, likewise, be liable for their activities and/or operations within the IRW which resulted in the release of the same alleged “hazardous substances” into the IRW.

63. Although CTP has denied and continues to deny all of the allegations of wrongdoing as alleged by Plaintiffs, should CTP be found liable under CERCLA § 107, and be ordered to pay natural resource damages to Plaintiffs, which could include, but not be limited to

“(a) the cost to restore, replace, or acquire the equivalent of such natural resources; (b) the compensable value of lost services resulting from the injury to such natural resources; and (c) the reasonable cost of assessing injury to the natural resources and the resulting damages,” then CTP is entitled to contribution pursuant to CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9613(f) and damages for unjust enrichment from Cross-Claim Defendants for their respective share of those damages because their activities and/or operations within the IRW have resulted in the release of some, if not all, of the same constituents alleged by the Plaintiffs as “hazardous substances” for their respective share of those damages.

64. In the Complaint, Plaintiffs allege that CTP is responsible for the past and present handling, storage and disposal of “a solid and/or hazardous waste” that presents “an imminent and substantial endangerment to health and the environment in the IRW.” Plaintiffs' allegations are that the application of poultry litter as a fertilizer and/or soil conditioner by CTP, its independent contract farmers and other third parties who purchase poultry litter as a fertilizer and/or soil conditioner and apply it to the lands within the IRW, presents an imminent and substantial endangerment to health and the environment. [Am. Cmplt. at ¶¶ 92-96]

65. Upon information and belief, Cross-Claim Defendants are responsible for their past and present activities and operations in the IRW, which have resulted in the release of some or all of the same constituents allegedly contained in poultry litter into the IRW. Therefore, if the Court finds that the application of poultry litter and its constituents as a fertilizer and/or soil conditioner to lands within the IRW constitutes the release of “a solid and/or hazardous waste under SWDA,” then the past and present conduct and activities of Cross-Claim Defendants which result in the release of some or all of the same constituents as allegedly contained in

poultry litter into the IRW would also constitute the release of “a solid and/or hazardous waste under SWDA.”

66. Furthermore, if the Court finds that the application of poultry litter as a fertilizer and/or soil conditioner by CTP, its independent contract farmers and other third party property owners constitutes the past and present handling, storage and disposal of “a solid and/or hazardous waste,” and further finds that CTP has created an alleged imminent and substantial endangerment in the IRW under SWDA, then the Court must also find that Cross-Claim Defendants’ activities and/or operations as defined in Paragraphs No. 6 - 12, above, which result in the release of some or all of the same constituents Plaintiffs allege are contained within poultry litter into the IRW, also constitute the past and present handling, storage and disposal of “a solid and/or hazardous waste,” and therefore, Cross Claim Defendants must also be found liable for creating any alleged imminent and substantial endangerment in the IRW under SWDA.

67. Therefore, in the event the Court finds CTP liable under SWDA, then Cross-Claim Defendants must also be held liable to CTP under its direct action under the Citizen Suit provisions of the SWDA for their activities and operations within the IRW. Moreover, if the Court issues any injunctive relief whether it be temporary or permanent against CTP, or requires it to engage in any clean-up, assessment or remediation efforts, Cross-Claim Defendants should also be required to participate in any injunctive relief, clean-up, assessment or remediation efforts.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, in the event Plaintiffs should receive any judgment against Third Party Plaintiff Cargill Turkey Production, LLC for their alleged injuries, Third Party Plaintiff likewise demands judgment against each Cross-Claim Defendant on each of the claims alleged, including

but not limited to the following:

- (1) any injunctive relief granted against CTP, including any relief which requires CTP to remediate, abate any activity or condition, and/or pay any costs associated with assessing and quantifying the amount of remediation or natural resource damages;
- (2) any damages or costs assessed against CTP for responding to any release or threatened release of any contaminate, pollutant or hazardous substance;
- (3) any liability assessed for past monetary damages including all costs and expenses;
- (4) any declaratory relief granted by the Court against CTP including any liability for future damages including all costs and expenses; and
- (5) any restitution damages.

In the event that Plaintiffs should receive any judgment against Cargill Turkey Production, LLC pursuant to Plaintiffs' claims brought under the SWDA, Cargill Turkey Production, LLC demands judgment against each Cross-Claim Defendant pursuant to its direct action under the Citizen Suit provisions of the SWDA requiring each Cross-Claim Defendant to:

- (1) comply with all applicable permits, standards, regulations, conditions, requirements, prohibitions with regard to their past or present handling, storage, treatment, transportation or disposal of their solid or hazardous wastes; and
- (2) take any other action necessary to abate and/or remediate any imminent and substantial endangerment to health or the environment to which they have contributed or are contributing.

In the event that Plaintiffs should receive any judgment against Cross-Claim Plaintiff Cargill Turkey Production, LLC pursuant to Plaintiffs' claims which requires Cargill Turkey Production, LLC to pay damages for or take any action with regard to any pollutant, contaminate

or hazardous substance which was released or emanated from any lands, facilities or operations of the Cross-Claim Defendants, Cargill Turkey Production, LLC demands judgment against Cross-Claim Defendants pursuant to its direct action under the law of unjust enrichment and be awarded:

(1) damages for any costs, assessments or monetary award against Cargill Turkey Production, LLC which are associated any pollutant, contaminate or hazardous substance which was released or emanated from any lands, facilities or operations of the Cross-Claim Defendants; and

(2) the cost of any injunctive relief awarded against Cargill Turkey Production, LLC which are associated any pollutant, contaminate or hazardous substance which was released or emanated from any lands, facilities or operations of the Cross-Claim Defendants.

Cross-Claim Plaintiff, Cargill Turkey Production, LLC also demands judgment against Cross-Claim Defendants for:

- (1) any punitive or exemplary damages;
- (2) attorney's fees and costs;
- (3) prejudgment interest; and
- (4) any further relief the Court deems just and appropriate.

Cross-Claim Plaintiff, Cargill Turkey Production, LLC requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted,

RHODES, HIERONYMUS, JONES, TUCKER & GABLE, PLLC

BY: _____

JOHN H. TUCKER, OBA #9110
COLIN H. TUCKER, OBA #16325
THERESA NOBLE HILL, OBA #19119
P.O. Box 21100
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74121-1100
Telephone: 918/582-1173
Facsimile: 918/592-3390

And

DELMAR R. EHRICH
DARA D. MANN
FAEGRE & BENSON LLP
2200 Wells Fargo Center
90 South Seventh Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Telephone: 612/766-7000
Facsimile: 612/766-1600
ATTORNEYS FOR CARGILL, INC. AND CARGILL TURKEY
PRODUCTION LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on the ____ day of _____, 2006, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk of Court using the ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants:

W. A. Drew Edmondson, Attorney General
Kelly Hunter Burch, Assistant Attorney General
J. Trevor Hammons, Assistant Attorney General
Robert D. Singletary

drew_edmondson@oag.state.ok.us
kelly_burch@oag.state.ok.us
trevor_hammons@oag.state.ok.us
Robert_singletary@oag.state.ok.us

Douglas Allen Wilson
Melvin David Riggs
Richard T. Garren
Sharon K. Weaver
Riggs Abney Neal Turpen Orbison & Lewis

doug_wilson@riggsabney.com
driggs@riggsabney.com
rgarren@riggsabney.com
sweaver@riggsabney.com

Robert Allen Nance
Dorothy Sharon Gentry
Riggs Abney

rnance@riggsabney.com
sgentry@riggsabney.com

J. Randall Miller
David P. Page
Louis W. Bullock
Miller Keffer & Bullock

rmiller@mkblaw.net
dpage@mkblaw.net
lbullock@mkblaw.net

William H. Narwold
Elizabeth C. Ward
Frederick C. Baker
Motley Rice

bnarwold@motleyrice.com
lward@motleyrice.com
fbaker@motleyrice.com

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFFS

Stephen L. Jantzen
Patrick M. Ryan
Paula M. Buchwald
Ryan, Whaley & Coldiron, P.C.

sjantzen@ryanwhaley.com
pryan@ryanwhaley.com
pbuchwald@ryanwhaley.com

Mark D. Hopson
Jay Thomas Jorgensen
Timothy K. Webster
Sidley Austin LLP

mhopson@sidley.com
jjorgensen@sidley.com
twebster@sidley.com

Robert W. George
Kutack Rock LLP

robert.george@kutackrock.com

**COUNSEL FOR TYSON FOODS, INC., TYSON POULTRY, INC., TYSON CHICKEN, INC.;
AND COBB-VANTRESS, INC.**

R. Thomas Lay
Kerr, Irvine, Rhodes & Ables

rtl@kiralaw.com

Thomas J. Grever
Lathrop & Gage, L.C.
Jennifer S. Griffin
Lathrop & Gage, L.C.
COUNSEL FOR WILLOW BROOK FOODS, INC.

tgrever@lathropgage.com
jgriffin@lathropgage.com

Robert P. Redemann
Lawrence W. Zeringue
David C. Senger
Perrine, McGivern, Redemann, Reid, Berry & Taylor, PLLC

rredemann@pmrlaw.net
lzingue@pmrlaw.net
dsenger@pmrlaw.net

Robert E. Sanders
E. Stephen Williams
Young Williams P.A.
COUNSEL FOR CAL-MAINE FOODS, INC. AND CAL-MAINE FARMS, INC.

rsanders@youngwilliams.com
steve.williams@youngwilliams.com

George W. Owens
Randall E. Rose
The Owens Law Firm, P.C.

gwo@owenslawfirmmpc.com
rer@owenslawfirmmpc.com

James M. Graves
Gary V. Weeks
Bassett Law Firm
COUNSEL FOR GEORGE'S INC. AND GEORGE'S FARMS, INC.

jgraves@bassettlawfirm.com

John R. Elrod
Vicki Bronson
Bruce W. Freeman
Conner & Winters, LLLP
COUNSEL FOR SIMMONS FOODS, INC.

jelrod@cwlaw.com
vbronson@cwlaw.com
bfreeman@cwlaw.com

A. Scott McDaniel
Chris A. Paul
Nicole M. Longwell
Philip D. Hixon
Joyce, Paul & McDaniel, PC
COUNSEL FOR PETERSON FARMS, INC.

smcdaniel@jpm-law.com
cpaul@jpm-law.com
nlongwell@jpm-law.com
phixon@jpm-law.com

Jo Nan Allen
COUNSEL FOR CITY OF WATTS

jonanallen@yahoo.com

Park Medearis
Medearis Law Firm, PLLC
COUNSEL FOR CITY OF TAHLEQUAH

medearislawfirm@sbcglobal.net

Todd Hembree
COUNSEL FOR TOWN OF WESTVILLE

hembreelaw1@aol.com

Tim K. Baker
Maci Hamilton Jessie

tbakerlaw@sbcglobal.net
maci.tbaker@sbcglobal.net

Tim K. Baker & Associates

**COUNSEL FOR GREENLEAF NURSERY CO., INC., WAR EAGLE FLOATS, INC., and
TAHLEQUAH LIVESTOCK AUCTION, INC.**

Kenneth E. Wagner

kwagner@lswsl.com

Marcus N. Ratcliff

mratcliff@lswsl.com

Laura E. Samuelson

lsamuelson@lswsl.com

Latham, Stall, Wagner, Steele & Lehman

COUNSEL FOR BARBARA KELLEY D/B/A DIAMOND HEAD RESORT

Linda C. Martin

lmartin@dsda.com

N. Lance Bryan

Doerner, Saunders, Daniel & Anderson, LLP

COUNSEL FOR SEQUOYAH FUELS, EAGLE NURSERY LLC & NORTHLAND FARMS

Ron Wright

ron@wsfw-ok.com

Wright, Stout, Fite & Wilburn

**COUNSEL FOR AUSTIN L. BENNETT AND LESLIE A. BENNET, INDIVIDUALLY AND
D/B/A EAGLE BLUFF RESORT**

R. Jack Freeman

jfreeman@grahamfreeman.com

Tony M. Graham

tgraham@grahamfreeman.com

William F. Smith

bsmith@grahamfreeman.com

Graham & Freeman, PLLC

**COUNSEL FOR "THE BERRY GROUP", CHERYL BEAMAN, PHILLIP BEAMAN, FALCON
FLOATS, AND OTHER VARIOUS THIRD PARTY DEFENDANTS**

Angela D. Cotner

angelacotneresq@yahoo.com

COUNSEL FOR TUMBLING T BAR L.L.C. and BARTOW AND WANDA HIX

Thomas J. McGeady

Ryan P. Langston

J. Stephen Neas

steve_neas@yahoo.com

Bobby Jay Coffman

bcoffman@loganlowry.com

Logan & Lowry, LLP

COUNSEL FOR LENA AND GARNER GARRISON; AND BRAZIL CREEK MINERALS, INC.

R. Pope Van Cleef, Jr.

Popevan@robertsonwilliams.com

Robertson & Williams

COUNSEL FOR BILL STEWART, INDIVIDUALLY AND D/B/A DUTCHMAN'S CABINS

Monte W. Strout

strout@xtremeinet.net

COUNSEL FOR CLAIRE WELLS AND LOUISE SQUYRES

Lloyd E. Cole, Jr.

colelaw@alltel.net

**COUNSEL FOR ILLINOIS RIVER RANCH PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION; FLOYD
SIMMONS; RAY DEAN DOYLE AND DONNA DOYLE; JOHN STACY D/B/A BIG JOHN'S
EXTERMINATORS; AND BILLY D. HOWARD**

Douglas L. Boyd

dboyd31244@aol.com

COUNSEL FOR HOBY FERRELL and GREATER TULSA INVESTMENTS, LLC

Jennifer F. Sherrill jfs@federmanlaw.com
William B. Federman wfederman@aol.com
Teresa Brown Marks teresa.marks@arkansasag.gov
Charles Livingston Moulton Charles.Moulton@arkansasag.gov
COUNSEL FOR ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION

John B. DesBarres mrjbdb@msn.com; johnd@wcalaw.com
COUNSEL FOR JERRY MEANS, DOROTHY ANN MEANS

Reuben Davis rdavis@boonesmith.com
Boone, Smith, Davis, Hurst & Dickman
COUNSEL FOR WAUHILLAU OUTING CLUB

David A. Walls wallsd@wwhlwlaw.com
Walls Walker Harris & Wolfe
COUNSEL FOR KERMIT AND KATHERINE BROWN

Thomas Janer scmj@sbcglobal.net
COUNSEL FOR SUZANNE M. ZEIDERS

K. Clark Phipps cphipps@ahn-law.com
Atkinson, Haskins, Nellis, Brittingham, Gladd & Carwile
COUNSEL FOR WANDA DOTSON

Steven E. Holden sholden@holdenokla.com
Michael L. Carr mcarr@holdenokla.com
Michelle B. Skeens mskeens@holdenokla.com
Robert E. Applegate rapplegate@holdenokla.com
Holden & Carr hc@holdenokla.com
COUNSEL FOR SNAKE CREEK MARINA, LLC

Michael D. Graves mgraves@hallestill.com
Dale Kenyon Williams, Jr. kwilliams@hallestill.com
COUNSEL FOR CERTAIN POULTRY GROWERS

Carrie Griffith griffithlawoffice@yahoo.com
COUNSEL FOR RAYMOND AND SHANNON ANDERSON

I also hereby certify that I served the attached documents by United States Postal Service, proper postage paid, on the following who are not registered participants of the ECF System:

Jerry M. Maddux
Shelby Connor Maddux Janer
P.O. Box Z
Bartlesville, OK 74005-5025
COUNSEL FOR SUZANNE M. ZEIDERS

Thomas C. Green
Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP
1501 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20005
**COUNSEL FOR TYSON FOODS, INC.,
TYSON POULTRY, INC., TYSON
CHICKEN, INC.; AND COBB-VANTRESS,
INC.**

G. Craig Heffington
20144 W. Sixshooter Rd.
Cookson, OK 74427
**ON BEHALF OF SIXSHOOTER RESORT
AND MARINA, INC.**

Jim Bagby
Rt. 2, Box 1711
Westville, OK 74965
PRO SE

Gordon W. Clinton
Susann Clinton
23605 S. Goodnight Lane
Welling, OK 74471
PRO SE

Doris Mares
Cookson Country Store and Cabins
32054 S. Hwy 82
P. O. B ox 46
Cookson, OK 74424
PRO SE

Eugene Dill
32054 S. Hwy 82
P. O. Box 46
Cookson, OK 74424
PRO SE

John E. and Virginia W. Adair Family Trust
Route 2, Box 1160
Stilwell, OK 74960
PRO SE

C. Miles Tolbert
Secretary of the Environment
State of Oklahoma
3800 North Classen
Oklahoma City, OK 73118
COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFFS

James R. Lamb
Dorothy Gene Lamb
Strayhorn Landing
Rt. 1, Box 253
Gore, OK 74435
PRO SE

James C. Geiger
Kenneth D. Spencer
Jane T. Spencer
Address unknown
PRO SE

Robin Wofford
Rt. 2, Box 370
Watts, OK 74964
PRO SE

Marjorie A. Garman
Riverside RV Resort and Campground LLC
5116 Hwy. 10
Tahlequah, OK 74464
PRO SE

Richard E. Parker
Donna S. Parker
Burnt Cabin Marina & Resort, LLC
34996 South 502 Road
Park Hill, OK 74451
PRO SE

William House
Cherrie House
PO Box 1097
Stilwell, OK 74960
PRO SE